

1 ALVERSON, TAYLOR,  
 2 MORTENSEN & SANDERS  
 3 KURT R. BONDS, ESQ.  
 4 Nevada Bar No. 6228  
 5 ADAM R. KNECHT, ESQ.  
 6 Nevada Bar No. 13166  
 7 7401 W. Charleston Boulevard  
 Las Vegas, NV 89117  
 (702) 384-7000  
[efile@alversontaylor.com](mailto:efile@alversontaylor.com)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

VOIP-PAL.COM, INC., a Nevada corporation,

CASE NO.: 2:16-cv-2338

Plaintiff,

v.

TWITTER, INC., a California corporation,

Defendant.

**STIPULATION AND PROPOSED  
ORDER TO STAY PENDING  
FINAL WRITTEN DECISIONS BY  
THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL  
BOARD IN *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
PROCEEDINGS**

It is hereby STIPULATED and AGREED between Plaintiff VoIP-Pal.com (“Plaintiff” or “Voip-Pal”) and Defendant Twitter, Inc. (“Defendant” or “Twitter”), to stay litigation in this matter until the Patent Trial and Appeal Board issues final written decisions in various pending IPR proceedings involving the very patents at issue in this action. Good cause exists for the requested stay:

1. VoIP-Pal filed this action on October 6, 2016, against Defendant, alleging infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,542,815 (the “‘815 patent”) and 9,179,005 (the “‘005 patent”). (ECF No. 1);

2. Prior to filing this action, Voip-Pal filed two similar cases in this Court; specifically, VoIP-Pal filed an action against Apple, Inc. (“Apple”) on February 9, 2016 also alleging infringement of the ‘815 patent and the ‘005 patent. (No. 2:16-cv-00260-RFB-VCF (the “Apple

ALVERSON, TAYLOR, MORTENSEN & SANDERS  
 LAWYERS  
 7401 WEST CHARLESTON BOULEVARD  
 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89117-1401  
 (702) 384-7000

1 litigation’’). Likewise, on February 10, 2016, Voip-Pal filed an action against Defendants Cellco  
 2 Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (“Verizon”) and AT&T Corp. (“AT&T”) asserting the same  
 3 claims (No. 2:16-cv-00271-RCJ-VCF (the “Verizon/AT&T litigation”));

4       3.      On June 15, 2016, Apple filed a petition for *inter partes* review (“IPR”) by the Patent  
 5 Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) concerning the ‘815 patent (the “Apple ’815 IPR petition”). Apple  
 6 also petitioned the PTAB to conduct IPR on the ‘005 patent (the “Apple ’005 IPR petition”);

7       4.      In July 2016, the parties in the Apple litigation and the Verizon/AT&T litigation filed  
 8 a stipulation and proposed order seeking a stay of the Apple litigation and the Verizon/AT&T  
 9 litigation pending the PTAB’s decisions on whether to institute IPR on the ’815 and ’005 patents.

10      5.      In July 2016, this Court granted the parties’ stipulations, ordering a stay of the Apple  
 11 litigation and the Verizon/AT&T litigation;

12      6.      On November 21, 2016, the PTAB instituted IPR on all asserted claims of the ’815  
 13 patent. (Decision, Institution of *Inter Partes* Review of United States Patent No. 8,542,815, *Apple*  
 14 *Inc. v. VoIP-Pal.com, Inc.*, IPR2016-01201 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 21, 2016) at 32);

15      7.      Likewise, on November 21, 2016, the PTAB instituted IPR on all asserted claims of  
 16 the ’005 patent. (Decision, Institution of *Inter Partes* Review of United States Patent No. 9,179,005,  
 17 *Apple Inc. v. VoIP-Pal.com, Inc.*, IPR2016-01198 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 21, 2016) at 31);

18      8.      By statute, the PTAB must issue final written decisions in the ’815 patent and ’005  
 19 patent IPR proceedings no later than November 21, 2017. 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11);

20      9.      On or about December 2016, the Court continued the stay in the Apple litigation and  
 21 the Verizon/AT&T litigation pending the PTAB’s issuance of final written decisions in the IPR  
 22 proceedings concerning the ’815 and ’005 Patents.

23      10.     In the instant matter, discovery has not yet begun, and a trial date has not yet been set  
 24 in this matter; and

25      11.     District courts, pursuant to their inherent power to control and manage their own  
 26 dockets, have discretion to stay an action pending the outcome of reexamination proceedings  
 27 (including IPR) before the United States Patent and Trademark Office. *Unwired Planet, LLC v.*  
*28 Google Inc.*, No. 3:12-cv-00504-MMD-VPC, 2014 WL 301002, at \*5 (D. Nev. Jan. 27, 2014).

1           Based on the foregoing, the parties agree, with the Court's permission, to stay this litigation  
 2 pending the PTAB's issuance of final written decisions in IPR proceedings concerning the '815 and  
 3 '005 patents. Specifically, the parties hereby agree to submit a status report ("Joint Status Report")  
 4 to the Court by January 26, 2018, outlining the parties' respective positions on how the case should  
 5 proceed in light of the PTAB's final written decisions. The parties further agree and stipulate to  
 6 entry of an Order staying litigation in this matter until the Court reviews the Joint Status Report and  
 7 makes a decision on how to proceed.

8           DATED the 26th day of January, 2017.

9           **IT IS SO AGREED AND STIPULATED:**

11           ALVERSON, TAYLOR, 12           MORTENSEN & SANDERS	11           BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER 12           SCHRECK, LLP
13 <u>/s/ Adam R. Knecht</u>	13 <u>/s/ Michael D. Rounds</u>
14           KURT R. BONDS, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 6228	14           MICHAEL D. ROUNDS, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 4734
15           ADAM R. KNECHT, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 13166	15           5371 Kietzke Lane Reno, NV 89511
16           7401 W. Charleston Boulevard Las Vegas, NV 89117	16           100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600 Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
17           (702) 384-7000 <a href="mailto:efile@alversontaylor.com">efile@alversontaylor.com</a>	17           Phone (775) 398-3800 <a href="mailto:mrounds@bhfs.com">mrounds@bhfs.com</a>
18	18 <i>Attorneys for Plaintiff</i>
19	19 <i>Attorneys for Defendant</i>

20

21           **IT IS SO ORDERED:**

22           RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II  
23           United States District Judge

24           Dated: 1/31/17